



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/764,782	01/17/2001	Glenn McGarry	018638-04-5010	7173
9629	7590	01/10/2008	EXAMINER	
MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW WASHINGTON, DC 20004			BORLINGHAUS, JASON M	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3693		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		01/10/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/764,782	MCGARRY ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Jason M. Borlinghaus	3693		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 October 2007.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 26 - 55 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 26 - 55 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ . 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Prosecution

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/16/07 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 26 - 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sandhu (US PG Pub. 2003/0033212) in view of McErlean (US Patent 7,024,462) and Official Notice.

Regarding Claims 26 – 35, Sandhu discloses a system comprising:

- one or more remotely located client devices (member/provider systems) to capture information (via the provider deal capture system) concerning one or more deals from one or more users (member/provider systems). (see fig. 1 & 14; para. 6; para. 843);
- the captured information identifying a party (internal party), a counterparty (external party) and one or more product types (trade type) of one or more financial products associated with the one or more deals. (see fig. 3, para. 225; para. 843 - 845);
- wherein the one or more deals are executed trades (completed transactions) and the one or more users (member/provider systems) are party or the counterparty to the one or more deals. (see para. 843); and
- a deal management computer (respective back-end systems) in communication with the one or more remotely located client devices (member/provider systems) to process the one or more deals through multiple deal states (processing) to completion. (see para. 7);
- wherein the one or more financial instruments include a derivative instrument (derivatives trading). (see abstract);

- wherein the one or more financial products include one or more of the following: swaps (interest rate swaps). (see para. 183);
- wherein the one or more remotely located client devices include an interface (user interface) to select the one or more product types of the one or more financial products and to identify the party and the counterparty associated with one or more deals. (see fig. 45 – 159);
- wherein the one or more remotely located client devices include an interface to access information concerning the one or more deals during processing of the one or more deals (interfaces that enable monitoring the status of transactions). (para. 1230 – 1461);
- wherein the multiple deal states include states for trade authorization (verification) and settlement (settlement and back-end processing). (see para. 1494 - 1497); and
- wherein the multiple deal states include (i) deal in process (active quote outstanding), (ii) deal pending trade authorization (verification), (iii) deal pending middle office processing (settlement) and (iv) deal in back office (back-end processing). (see para. 1494 - 1497); and
- wherein completion of the one or more deals results in a mature deal (accepted and executed deal) or an inactive deal (expired deal). (see para. 1240 & 1496 - 1497).

Sandhu does not teach that the system routes deals based on the one or more product types of the one or more financial products associated with the one or more deals.

McErlean discloses a system comprising routing messages based on one or more types (tags).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Sandhu by incorporating a routing of deals (information) based upon the type of deal (information tag), as disclosed McErlean, to allow for the most efficient and productive processing of the submitted deals.

Although Sandhu does not explicitly disclose that the party or counterparty to the above deals are a hedge fund or an investment bank, although Sandhu states that his system "enables institutional investors and financial institutions" to overcome deficiencies in the prior art. (see para. 05). Hedge funds and investment banks fall within the scope of that language. Furthermore, such claim language appears to be directed toward intended use (identifying the intended users of the claimed system).

Regardless, Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known that hedge funds and investment banks are traditional and conventional parties to financial transactions in the art of investing and financial markets.

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Sandhu and McErlean by incorporating such users as are old and well known in the art, as such users are standard and traditional participants in the activities to which the claimed invention is directed towards.

Regarding Claims 36 – 55, such claims recite similar limitations as claimed in previously rejected claims, would have been obvious based upon previously rejected claims, or are otherwise disclosed by the prior art applied in previously rejected claims. Such claim limitations are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale as previously utilized. Applicant is reminded that any argument contrary to such an interpretation is an indication of patentably distinct subject matter that may warrant a restriction requirement.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to pending claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason M. Borlinghaus whose telephone number is (571) 272-6924. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Kramer can be reached on (571) 272-6783. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jason Borlinghaus (JMB)

January 3, 2008

James A. Kramer 12/3/08
JAMES A. KRAMER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600